

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-12 are pending.

Claim 1 is rejected as being anticipated by Maurer.

Amended Claim 1 recites a personalized multilayer support in the general shape of a card. The support has a card body which is provided on an upper face with personal information which is visible from the exterior of the support, an at least partially transparent film which is fixed to the upper face of the card body, and marker lines. The marker lines have weld beads formed at the interface between the film and the card body. The weld beads delimit zones of the film having increased mechanical strength with respect to the film being peeled off the card body. The marker lines form tear scores so that the film is torn at the tear scores if an attempt is made to peel off the film. The marker lines depict at least one identification motif which is visible from the exterior of the support.

Maurer discloses an identification card having a card inlay 13 and a cover film 11. The cover film 11 includes laser inscribed indicia. The Examiner, in noting that Maurer does not explicitly disclose weld beads, takes the position that "the material remaining between the film and body after heat is transferred to the areas of 15-17 and 29, for example, by the laser [inherently] constitutes a weld bead". However, Maurer does not explicitly disclose any such heat transfer to those areas. Moreover, Maurer's laser does not necessarily result in such heat transfer as required for inherency. Thus, Maurer does not explicitly or inherently anticipate a weld bead formed at the interface between a film and a card body as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, Maurer does not explicitly disclose zones of the film having increased mechanical strength with respect to the cover film 11 being peeled off the card inlay 13, nor does Maurer's card necessarily include such zones as required for inherency. Thus, Maurer does not explicitly or inherently anticipate weld beads delimiting zones of a film having increased mechanical strength with respect to the film being peeled off a card body as recited in Claim 1.

Moreover, Maurer does not explicitly disclose marker lines forming tear scores so that the cover film 11 is torn at the tear scores if an attempt is made to peel off the cover film 11, nor does Maurer's card necessarily include such marker lines as required for inherency. Thus, Maurer does not explicitly or inherently anticipate marker lines forming tear scores so that a film is torn at the tear scores if an attempt is made to peel off the film as recited in Claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over Maurer, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7, the only other pending independent claim, is also rejected as being anticipated by Maurer.

Amended Claim 7 recites a method of manufacturing a personalized multilayer support in the general shape of a card, including an assembly step, during which an at least partially transparent film is fixed to the upper face of a card body, a personalization step, during which personal information is placed on the upper face of the card body so that the personal information is visible from the exterior of the support through the transparent film, and a security step that is carried out after the assembly step. During the security step, marker lines are produced by means of a laser beam so as to form weld beads at the interface between the transparent film

and the card body. The weld beads delimit zones of the film having increased mechanical strength with respect to the film being peeled off the card body. The marker lines form tear scores with a view to causing the film to be torn at the tear scores if an attempt is made to peel off the film.

Amended Claim 7 is allowable for reasons consistent with the above discussion of Claim 1.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 30, 2008

By: Peter T. deVore  
James A. LaBarre  
Registration No. 28,632

Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60,361

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620